



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,470	03/19/2007	Gerardus Petrus Scholtie	MULLE47.001APC	2948
20995	7590	09/15/2009	EXAMINER	
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP			NGUYEN, CHI Q	
2040 MAIN STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
FOURTEENTH FLOOR				3635
IRVINE, CA 92614				
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		09/15/2009	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com
eOAPilot@kmob.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/550,470	Applicant(s) SCHOLTE, GERARDUS PETRUS
	Examiner CHI Q. NGUYEN	Art Unit 3635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 September 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 4-6 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 September 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This Office action is in response to applicant's patent application filed on 12/19/2005.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 12/19/2005 is being considered by the examiner.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because of lacking of lead line for every figure.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: --A Multifunctional Frame--

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Headings are missing.

Appropriate correction is required.

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: a disclosure should not be used claim languages, e.g. comprises.

Appropriate correction is required.

The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Objections

Claims 4-6 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim(s). See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 4-6 not been further treated on the merits.

Claims 2-3 are objected to because of the following informalities: the claimed preamble for claims 2-3 should be read --The multifunctional frame--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 2-3 are objected to because of the following informalities: a citation "characterized in" should read --wherein--. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

Regarding claim 1, the phrases "like e.g." and "may be" render the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "or the like" or "may be"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s)

unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d). Claims 2-3 depending upon the rejected claim 1 are also rejected.

Regarding claim 1, recitations "1.1; 1.1.1; 1.1.2; 1.2" are not understood and should be removed from the claim.

Claim 1, recitation "which profile element" should read --which said profile element--. Correction is required.

Claim 1, recitation "a mainly straightly directed" should read --a mainly straight--. Correction is required.

Claim 1, recitation "on both sides over an angle" should read --on both sides at an angle--. Correction is required.

Claim 1, recitation "which is in a position parallel or not to the first vertical part" is confusing and indefinite. Clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

As best understood, claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat. No. 6,029,428 to Terminella et al.

Claim 1:

Terminella et al. disclose in Figs. 13-14, a multifunctional constructional modular element 610 for machine-building purposes comprising: a profile element made of solid

strong sheet material, which said profile element consists of an infinite profile comprising a mainly straight horizontal part 690/692 that tapers off on both sides at an angle of approximately 90° to a first downwardly directed vertical part 636 and a second downwardly directed vertical part 656 which is in a position parallel or not to the first vertical part; at least one of the vertical profile parts 690 longitudinally being provided at mutually regular distances with cut-away portions for the insertion of at least a hollow functional socket 648 for interconnection of the vertical profile part 636 to a compact unit, which functional socket is inter-fixed, the functional socket also being provided with internal threading 642 to receive an appropriate coupling element or module for use in a machine building construction, provided with a mating external threading; one and another in such a way that girders and vertical stands for the construction of a machine.

Claim 2:

Wherein that both the profile element as well as the hollow functional socket are made of stainless steel (col. 9. line 6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

As best understood, claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat. No. 6,029,428 to Terminella et al.

Claim 3:

Terminella et al. disclose the claimed invention as stated but do not disclose expressly wherein that in a cross-section the profile element is C- or U-shaped and having a wall thickness of approximately 2 mm. However, this feature would have been a matter of obvious design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have such a wall thickness of 2mm and profile of the frame is C or U shape based on its desirable applications. Furthermore, applicant has not disclosed the criticality of this feature.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Chi Q. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-6847. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 am-4:00 pm.

If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Chilcot can be reached at (571) 272-6777.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pairdirect.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866) 217-9197.

Art Unit: 3635

/C. Q. N./
Examiner, Art Unit 3635
/Richard E. Chilcot, Jr./

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3635